REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are currently pending in the present application and are presently under consideration. Claim 6 has been cancelled herein. Claims 1-3, 7, 9, and 10-12 have been amended herein to further distinguish the claimed invention from the cited art. All pending claims with status identifiers are found at pages 2-4.

Favorable reconsideration is requested in view of the comments below.

I.   **Rejection of Claims 1-20 Under U.S.C. §102(e)**

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Anglin (US 6,260,069). Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-5 and 7-20 is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons. Anglin does not disclose, teach, or suggest each and every limitation as recited in the subject claims.

> For a prior art reference to anticipate, 35 U.S.C. §102 requires that "each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *In re Robertson*, 169 F.3d 743, 745, 49 USPQ2d 1949, 1950 (Fed. Cir. 1999) (*quoting Verdegaal Bros., Inc. v. Union Oil Co.*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)).

Referring to independent claims 1, 10 and 12 Anglin does not disclose or suggest *comparing an applied trust level of an application with a trust level of a module called by the application and regulating access of the application to a distributed computing platform based at least in part upon the comparison* or similar limitations as recited in these claims. Rather, Anglin discloses a system utilized for backing up files in a distributed computing system, wherein a program is initiated to request backup of a particular file. In Anglin, for security purposes, a client is authenticated by an authentication service, which provides binary security with respect to particular files. For one specific example of this binary security, col. 6 lines 15-20 states,

> If the client 4 delegation token does not permit access to the requested file, then control transfers to block 58 which represents the file server 8 transmitting a message to the backup server 6 via the DFS server client program 10

5

indicating that the delegation token does not permit access
to the requested file.

With more detail relating to the delegation token, such token enables an intermediary
server to act on behalf of an initiating client while preserving client and server identities
(as well as access control attributes). This allows an intermediary server to utilize and
pass identity of a client without altering an authentication level of a backup server. (*See*
col. 5, line 60 – col. 6 line 3). If the delegation token provides access, then a requested
file can be moved to a backup server.

      In contrast to the system of Anglin (which is utilized to backup files in a
distributed computing environment), applicant's invention as recited in the subject claims
facilitates securing a distributed platform from untrusted and/or partially trusted
applications/modules. For example, an application can request access to a distributed
computing platform, and the application can originate from a trusted vendor. A
component can analyze the application and apply a trust level to such application. In
accordance with the above example, as the application originates from a trusted vendor, a
trust level of "fully trusted" can be applied thereto. If, however, the application attempts
to call a module that is associated with a "run restricted" trust level, the invention as
recited in these claims can *compare/analyze the trust levels of the application and the
module and regulate access of the application based at least in part upon the
comparison*. In particular, as the application calls a module with a "run restricted" trust
level, the trust level of the application can be re-defined as "run-restricted," and the
application can be allowed to run as such (*e.g.*, the application can be prevented from
overwriting particular data relating to the distributed computing platform). Anglin,
however, <u>nowhere</u> discloses, teaches, or suggests any sort of *comparison of trust levels
to regulate access to a distributed computing platform* as claimed. More specifically,
there is no mention of any sort of comparison within Anglin. Furthermore, Anglin does
not disclose an application calling a module, a module calling a module, or any other
similar language that would anticipate the invention as claimed.

      Referring now to claims 3 and 13, Anglin further does not disclose, teach, or
suggest (inherently or otherwise) *marking the application with at least one of states: (1)
fully trusted, (2) run restricted, and (3) fail to load* as recited in these claims. The

6

09/671,388   MS150832.02/MSFTP150US

Examiner has stated that the above limitation "can be implemented by a person of

ordinary skill in the art..." Such a conclusory phrase, however, is not representative of

the Examiner's burden under 35 U.S.C. §102.

> Inherency, however, may not be established by
> probabilities or possibilities. The mere fact that a certain
> thing may result from a given set of circumstances is not
> sufficient." *Mehl/Biophile Int'l Corp. v. Milgraum*, 192
> F.3d 1362, 1365, 52 USPQ2d 1303, 1305 (Fed. Cir. 1999),
> reh'g denied, 1999 U.S. App. LEXIS 31386 (Fed. Cir. Oct.
> 27, 1999) (*quoting In re Oelrich*, 666 F.2d 578, 581, 212
> USPQ 323, 326 (CCPA 1981)).

Moreover, Anglin does not provide any motivation for utilizing levels of trust

(*e.g., (1) fully trusted, (2) run restricted, and (3) fail to load*). As described above,

Anglin relates to a system utilized for backing up files in a distributed computing system,

and does not relate to applications that are associated with trust levels. In particular, the

security described within Anglin is binary, wherein a program either has authority to

backup a file or does not have authority to back up a file. Accordingly, Anglin does not

disclose, teach, or suggest the limitations of claims 3 and 13.

In view of the foregoing, it is readily apparent that Anglin does not anticipate nor

make obvious the invention as recited in claims 1, 10, and 12 (and claims 2-5, 7-9, 11,

and 13-20 which respectfully depend therefrom). Accordingly, this rejection should be

withdrawn.

7

09/671,388   .   MS150832.02/MSFTP150US

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063.

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP

Himanshu S. Amin
Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731

8